

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2005

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/933,260	08/20/2001 7590 06/13/2005		Mahshid Ellie Abdollahi	68775-043	5264
21890				EXAMINER	
PROSKAUI			TON, DANG T		
PATENT DE 1585 BROAL		NT	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
NEW YORK	NY 100	36-8299	2666	-	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
<b></b>	09/933,260	ABDOLLAHI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	DANG T TON	2666				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state that the period for reply will be stated to the pe	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thirt od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed  y (30) days will be considered timely.  THS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20	) August 2001.					
	his action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd 5) ☐ Claim(s) 16-19 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 and 12-15 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 9-11 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami	iner.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ a	ccepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	he drawing(s) be held in abeyar	ice. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	*	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<u> </u>						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ents have been received. ents have been received in A riority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	_					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	——————————————————————————————————————	nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2666

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Applicant should provide the status of copending applications recited in the specification including the filing date.

Appropriate correction is required.

- 2. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.
- 3. Claims 1-8 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1 line 7, " the message" has no antecedent basis. Similar problem exists in claims 2-4.

In claim 12 line 3-4, "the particular command" and "the previously received particular packet" have no antecedent basis.

Claim 5-8 and 13-15 are rejected since they depend from claim 1 or claim 12.

4. Claims 1-15 are objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75 because of the following formalities:

In claim 1 line 5, " a payload " seems to refer back to " a payload" recited at line 4. If this is true, it is suggested to change " the payload" to --- the payload ---. Similar problem exists in claim 9.

Claims 2-8 and 10-15 are objected since they depend from claim 1 or claim 9.

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-8 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of copending Application No. 09/933,265. Although the conflicting claims are not identical,

Art Unit: 2666

they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the following formalities:

For claims 1-8, the claims 1-10 of the copending application number 09/933,265 discloses a method of managing one or more nodes comprising the steps of: (a) forming a packet comprising a network layer header, including a destination address for routing a packet to a destination, a second header identifying a syntax and semantic by which a payload of the packet may be parsed in a predefined fashion, and a payload containing a message to be executed by each of one or more to-be-managed nodes to which the packet is destined, (b) transmitting the packet plural times to a plurality of nodes, including the one or more to-be-managed nodes, wherein the message in the particular packet is executed only a single time regardless of the number of times that a copy of the particular packet is received in the state enabling execution by the to-be-managed nodes of the message therein, and wherein the transmission of the particular packet plural times increases the likelihood that each of the to-be-managed nodes receives at least one copy of the particular packet in the state enabling execution of the message contained therein;

wherein said message is a command;

Application/Control Number: 09/933,260 Page 5

Art Unit: 2666

wherein said message is one of a command message, control message, file download message, auto discovery message, and keep-alive message;

further comprising the step of: (c) after transmitting the particular packet plural times transmitting a second packet at least once containing a command for causing one or more of the to-be-managed nodes to execute once a command previously received one or more times in one of the previously transmitted packets, regardless of the number of copies of the particular packet received in a state enabling execution by the to-be-managed nodes of the command therein;

wherein a to-be-managed node stores each copy of each command received in one or more of the particular packets, but executes only a single version of each command received regardless of the number of copies of the particular packet received in a state enabling execution by the to-be-managed nodes of the command therein;

further comprising the step of: (d) inserting into the particular packet information identifying a version of the command contained therein for purposes of enabling a to-bemanaged node to identify duplicate copies of the command which need not be executed;

Application/Control Number: 09/933,260

wherein the particular packet is inserted into a digital program signal containing variable length programs, so as not to disrupt the relative arrival timing of portions of the program signal;

wherein the particular packet is transmitted via a broadcast satellite network;

wherein step (b) transmits said packet plural time after a predetermined delay; and

wherein each of the one or more to-be-managed nodes lacks a return path for acknowledging to a source of the particular packet that the particular packet has been received in a state enabling execution of the message contained therein.

Note: see claims 1-10 of the copending application.

Applicant's claims 1-8 merely broaden the scope of copending application 09/933,265 claims 1-10 by eliminating the terms "only a single time regardless of the number of times that a copy of the particular packet is received in the state enabling execution by the to-be-managed nodes of the message therein " and "increases the likelihood that each of the to-be-managed nodes receives at least one copy of the particular packet in the state enabling execution of the message contained therein "from claim 1 of the copending application. It has been

Application/Control Number: 09/933,260

Art Unit: 2666

held that the omission of an element and its function is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the same function as before. In re karlson, 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA). Also note Ex Parte Raine, 168 USPQ 375 (bd. App. 1969); omission of a reference element whose function is not need would be obvious to one skilled in the art.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

- 6. Claims 9-11 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the objection under 37 C.F.R 1.75.
  - 7. Claims 16-19 are allowed.
- 8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Mallory et al. (6,877,043) and Bagchi et al. (6,882,634) are all cited to show systems which are considered pertinent to the claimed invention.

Application/Control Number: 09/933,260 Page 8

Art Unit: 2666

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANG T TON whose telephone number is 571-272-3171. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-WED, 5:30 AM-6:00 PM and Thur 5:30-9:30 A.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, RAO SEEMA can be reached on 571-272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

D. Ton